REMARKS

The claims have been amended by rewriting claims 1 and 12, canceling claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 22, 25, 28, and 29, and adding new claims 30-32. Claims 1-7, 10, 12-16, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27, and 30-32 are now in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Pavlo et al., U.S. patent 6,377,125. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claim 1 has been amended by adding: "wherein the phase and delay of each transmission path are chosen to optimize an out-of-phase addition of a plurality of induced noise contributions that are essentially in-phase on the corresponding one or more transmission paths."

Claim 12 has been amended by adding: "wherein each of the one or more transistive elements is associated with an inductive element that couples an induced noise signal into the transistive element, and wherein the induced noise signals coupled into the one or more transistive elements have essentially the same phase, and wherein the one or more coupling elements, the one or more additive elements, and the one or more inductive elements are chosen to optimize an out-of phase addition of the induced noise signals"

The additions to claims 1 and 12 are supported by the following text portions from Applicants' specification, in conjunction with the rest of the application.

Page 5, line 27 to page 6, line 4:

"Each emitter terminal of the four transistive elements is coupled to ground through an inductive element. The emitter of transistive element 239 is coupled to ground 263 through inductive element 251..."[similar statement for each inductive element 254, 256, 258]

Page 6, lines 6-20:

"Also shown in **Fig. 2** is the parasitic inductance (251, 254, 257, and 260) associated with the individual emitter connections to the integrated substrate ground. Devices in a very close location to each other will have substrate induced signals applied with essentially the

same phas into each of th d vices. At interference or crosstalk frequencies different from the desired signal, the summed nodes will have un-correlated interfer nce signals. The result will b an improvement in the desired to interference or crosstalk signal ratio as a result of the correlated desired signal summing compared to the un-correlated interference or crosstalk signal summing. In an alternate embodiment of the present invention, this can be extended to the supply interference or crosstalk with the use of individual supply choke connections to each of the distributed device collectors of transistive elements (239, 242, 245, 248).

There are some degrees of freedom in the distributed design delays to enhance the un-correlated rejection that will be a function out-of-phase value at each of the summing nodes."

Page 6, lines 28-29: "...the device shunt parasitics (251, 254, 257, and 260)..."

Page 10, lines 18-23:

"A noise signal originating at a device ground or supply terminal will share a portion of this distributed network of **FIG. 2** and the associated phase shift. The simplified circuit of **FIG. 3** provides a set of analytical expressions to design non-coherent noise signal processing to the V_{out} node coupled to impedance element 380 and inductive element 375 without affecting the coherent SOI signal processing."

The amended claims include reference to induced noise that is presented essentially in-phase at the nodes of the parasitic and/or choke inductors that are coupled to the transistor emitters and collectors, and the use of coupling elements chosen in combination with the parasitic and choke inductors to minimize the resulting noise while combining the amplified components of the signal of interest in phase.

Applicants believe that the amended claims 1 and 12 are patentable, and thus also believe that the dependent claims remaining in the application, which are dependent on one of the independent claims, are also patentable.

The Applicants note the art cited, but not relied upon by the Examiner.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

James A. Lamb
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 38,529

Telephone:(847) 576-5054
Fax No.: (847) 576-3750

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917